Subsequently the following heads of other Government departments were addressed as to whether they required any of these tractors:—

The Director of Industries.

The Chief Engineer, Roads and Buildings, Public Works Department.

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The Chief Engineer, Hydro-Electric Development.

The Chief Engineer in charge of Cauvery-Mettur Project and the Inspector-General of Prisons.

No offers have so far been received from these departments, but the Forest Engineer to the Government of Bombay has examined some of the tractors and it is hoped that an offer for one of them may be received.

The Government have accepted an offer of Rs. 3,250 for the Beypore mill machinery, which covers the sale of the tractors used in connexion with that mill.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know at what stage the disposal of the machinery is?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"So far as the disposal of the machinery is concerned, every stage has been concluded."

Closing of the Kodikana reserve forest for grazing.

*238 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Kodikana reserve forest in South Mangalore division has been closed to grazing of the village cattle from the beginning of June 1932, and, if so, for what reasons;

(*b*) whether any other reserve forest areas in this division have been similarly closed to grazing this year; and

(*c*) whether the residents of Thodikana village have submitted any petition to the Collector of South Kanara in regard to the closing of the forest to grazing, and, if so, whether a copy of that petition will be placed on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) Yes; the reserve was closed to grazing on account of three fires which occurred in it.

(*b*) The following areas also were closed to grazing for the same reason:—

(1) Kalpatimale Reserved Forest ...	Whole
(2) Veera Kamba bit II Reserved Forest.	Part
(3) Bantamale Reserved Forest ...	Part
(4) Medinadka Reserved Forest ...	Part
(5) Bantaji Reserved Forest ...	Whole
(6) Sampajee Reserved Forest ...	Part

[1st November 1932

(c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to clause (b) of question No. 95 answered on the 4th August 1932.

Grazing and compounding fees collected in the Thodikana reserve.

* 239 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of animals licensed to graze last year in the Thodikana reserve forest in South Mangalore division;

(b) the grazing fees collected therefrom last year;

(c) the number of cattle impounded by forest subordinates in Thodikana in May and in June this year;

(d) the rate of impounding fee to be paid for each buffalo or cow; and

(e) the compounding fees collected in June 1932 from the villagers whose cattle strayed into the forest area closed to grazing?

A.—(a) 235 { 221 cows or bulls.
14 buffaloes.

(b) Rs. 91-10-0.

(c) 19 { 12 cows or bulls.
7 buffaloes.

(d) Rs. 2 per buffalo and
Re. 1 per cow or bull.

(e) Nil.

Withdrawal of grazing rights in certain forests in Puttur and Kasaragod taluks.

* 240 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Medinadka block of reserved forest in Puttur taluk and the Bantaje block in Kasaragod range have been closed to grazing for a period of one year from 30th June 1932;

(b) whether the alleged reason for the withdrawal of the grazing rights in these blocks is an excess of forest fires in the course of the last year; and

(c) whether any enquiry has been made into the number and the causes of such fires and if so, the particulars of such enquiry and its results?

A.—(a) A part of Medinadka West Reserved Forest and the whole of Bantaje Reserved Forest have been closed to grazing.

(b) The closures have been enforced on account of fires.

(c) There were 13 cases of fire in these reserves during the years 1931 and 1932. In some cases enquiries into the origin of fire were made by the Range Officer and in others by the forest guards concerned. There was definite proof of incendiarism in one case; while in one case the report definitely says that the fire was not wilfully caused. The origin of the rest can only be matter of surmise.